1:Vaillant A-5 (1928-1936)1941 NU7 Aztec NU7



munication between the mother country and the colonies became increasingly difficult. Control was loosened, and laws for the benefit of the Indians were ignored. They became, indeed, an inferior majority, laboring as peons without hope of legal or social justice.[8]

Most of the Indians lost their land and labored on haciendas or in the mines. Some communities like Tlaxcala, having performed notable service to the Crown during the Conquest, kept their land although they had lost social status. Other groups, like the lake peoples of Xochimilco and Chalco, occupied territory which the Spaniards considered unsuitable for their own purposes. A fourth group lived relatively unmolested in primitive little villages tucked away in the mountains. These refugees had taken to the hills not only because of the white conquerors but also to avoid the rising Indian powers in the centuries before the Conquest. The several-score languages and dialects spoken in Mexico are preserved in these tiny villages where inhabitants are only lightly veneered with Christianity.

What remains of Indian culture today is largely the blend of early indigenous practices with the teachings of the friars in the sixteenth century. Yet the physical type and the languages have resisted absorption for four centuries. In Mexico there is hardly a group which remains as completely Indian as some of the North American tribes, but they, after all, have for the most part been conquered and put on reservations only in the last three generations. The groups who had earlier contact with the whites were exterminated many years ago.[9]

The Mexican Indians have endured and have done the work of Mexico for four centuries. They have seen the whites

15:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7



622
618
423

child),[99] and those who cultivated them carried the appellation of "tlalmaitl"—hands of the soil.[100]

The "tlalmilpa," whether held by chiefs or by ordinary members of the kin ("macehuales") were, therefore, the only tracts of land possessed for use by individuals in ancient Mexico. They were so far distinguished from the "tecpantlalli" and "tlatocatlalli" in their mode of tenure as, whereas the latter two were dependent

423

[99] It is just the "pillali" which oppose the greatest difficulties to this investigation, and to a clear conception of the mode of tenure of lands in ancient Mexico. They are generally represented (whenever mentioned), as private domains of the chiefs. Torquemada (Lib. XIV, pp. 345 and 346), distinguishes two kinds of "pillali." The first one he says might be sold.—but he places the restriction upon them, that such as held lands through conquest ("sujecion") or through gift ("merced") of the chief, had to go to the descendants, as majorat; and if they died without heirs, the King, or Lord became such, and they were incorporated into his royal Estates." The other kind was not transmissible at all. Clavigero (Lib. XVII, cap. XIV). We notice here a confusion between official tracts and such lots of the "calpulli" as pertained to the chief's family in consequence of their membership of the Kin. Also between "tribute-lots" and the official tracts, of conquered tribes. Torquemada acknowledges, that the "pillali," upon the death of the family, were incorporated in the calpulli to which that family belonged, "in order that they might pay tribute." This ought to define their true position and nature.

[428]

[100] From "tlalli" soil, and "maitl" hand. Hands of the soil. Molina (Parte IIa, p. 134), has: "tlalmaitl"—"labrador, ò gañan." This name is given in distinction of the "macehuales" or people working the soil in general. The tlalmaites are identical with the "mayeques." See Zurita (p. 224), "tlalmaites or mayeques, which signifies tillers of the soil of others . . . ." He distinguishes them plainly from the "tercallec" which are the "tecpanpouhque" or "tecpantlaca" formerly mentioned as attending to a class of official lands (p. 231, Zurita). Herrera (Dec. III, lib. IV, cap. XVII, p. 136). "These mayeques could not go from one tract to another, neither leave those which they cultivated, and they paid a rent to its masters according as they agreed upon ("en lo que se concertaban") in what they raised. They paid tribute to nobody else but the master of the land." This tends to show that there existed, not an established obligation, a serfdom, but a voluntary contract, that the "tlalmaites" were not serfs, but simply renters. Torquemada (Lib. XIV, cap. VII. p. 345). ". . . . those that were knights ("caballeros") and descendants of the families of the Kings, and Lords, had their particular lands and their rentals, where many of them held renters ("terrazgueros") which served them, tilled the crops and served them in their houses. These lands were called pillali or "land of nobles and knights." We prefer the etymology "piltontli" "niño ò niña, muchacho ó muchacha" (Molina, II, p. 82), or "piltzintli" niño ó niña" therefore lands of the children,—to the derivation from "pilli." The title of chief was "tecuhtli," and the word "pilli" substituted for it is certainly but in connection with the occupation of a particular place of office, and not a title itself. Bustamante ("Tezcoco, etc.," p. 230. "The sovereigns as well as the inferior Lords and other principals had their own patrimonial estates, and in them their mayeques or Tlalmayes, what these gave of rent were tributes of the Lord," Id. pp. 233 and 234).

427

[566]

The "tlalmaites" appear to have been free from other tributes, and free from communal labor outside of the "pillali" (Bustamante, p. 233. Herrera, Dec. III, lib. IV, cap. XVII, p. 136). It is not very clear, however, whether this applies simply to the conquering tribe alone, or also to the tlalmaites of conquered tribes, as towards the tribute due by that tribe to their conquerors. The detailed relations between the two are yet somewhat obscure and confuse in some points.

[444]